under Forest had gone down, he was glad that the revenue from other sources was steadily improving since 1935-36. He was grateful to the Government for introducing prohibition in the Closepet area. He hoped that some more shops would be closed in the area in the coming year. He also appealed to Government to try prohibition in some more areas so that a large number of poor families might live in peace and happiness.

At this stage, the House rose for lunch and met again at 3-30 p.m.

Mr. M. RAME GOWDA also thanked the Financial Secretary for the surplus budget presented to the House. He represented that the raiyats in Kolar District were groaning under heavy taxation, and that adequate and speedy relief must be given to them. The grant provided for repairs and maintenance to major and minor tanks in the Kolar District was very poor and must be increased if the raiyats were to be benefited.

Regarding electric lighting of the villages, he requested that Government be pleased to supply lights of 60 candle-power at the current rate of Rs. 18 per annum. The grant of Rs. 1,50,000 provided for village panchayets was hardly adequate. After meeting establishment charges, very little would remain over for actual improvement purposes. He requested that at least Rs. 10,00,000 must be ear-markedf or improvement works. In view of the increasing income from the Gold Mines the speaker requested that the raiyats' contributions for tank works, at least in the Kolar District, be not insisted upon, and that restoration works be taken up without further delay.

Mr. H. KRISHNAMURTHI ACHAR complimented the Dewan on his progressive industrial and irrigational policy. One of the members had remarked that hospitals were not receiving adequate supplies of medicines, etc. The member suggested that Government might open a factory in the State itself for manufacturing medicines required for local consumption. He then represented that the Darga at Mulbagal needed repairs and a sum of Rs. 1,000 at least should be sanctioned for the purpose. Similarly, the Ganapathi Temple at Kulmane was a very special kind of institution and at least a sum of Rs. 5,000 was required for restoring it.

He joined the Muslim member from Chitaldrug in requesting that all ancient mosques and temples in the State must be kept in good repair and that a grant of Rs. 50,000 should be allotted for the purpose in the annual budgets.

Regarding village improvements, the speaker regretted that the grant was very much less than what was provided for the two cities of Bangalore and Mysore. He was of opinion that if the villages did not improve, the progress of the cities also would be affected. Just as every village had a panchayet, every taluk must have a Taluk Board and contributions from the village panchayets, together with the Government aid, must be utilised for the improvement of village communications. With their present resources, the District Boards were unable to construct even one mile of new road. So the member suggested that District Boards might be abolished and Taluk Boards constituted instead.

With regard to Education, the speaker suggested that instead of increasing the number of schools, it would be much better if the working of the already existing schools was improved. Many schools were not being opened for months together sometimes, and the School Board Officers were not inspecting the schools properly. For this reason he requested that the School Boards be abolished and the jurisdiction now vested in the District Boards as local education authorities be withdrawn, the Government themselves assuming control over the schools. From the savings accruing to Government in this way, he hoped that at least 100 new schools could be started every year.

RESOLUTIONS ON THE BUDGET.

Resolution No. 1.

Opening of New Middle Schools in the State.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA moved the following resolution :--

" This Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that they will be pleased to adequately enhance the provision made in the Budget for 1940-41 under the heading 'Education—for opening of new Middle Schools in the State.' "

At the outset, he suggested that if the Government view could be explained as soon as a resolution was moved and seconded, all the resolutions on the budget could be disposed of.

Referring to this particular resolution he stated that, as all the details had already been mentioned in the course of the general discussion on the budget, he had nothing more to add except that the grant already provided for the expansion of middle schools was not sufficient and that Government might kindly enhance it.

Mr. D. VENKATARAMANAPPA seconded the resolution.

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina K. V. Anantaraman) replied that Government would consider the matter. Some proposals relating to this question were already under consideration. Government were aware that the number of new schools proposed to be started would not be enough.

The resolution was withdrawn by leave of the House.

Resolution No. 2.

Additional Teachers for Middle Schools.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA moved the following resolution :—

" This Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that they will be pleased to enhance the provision made in the Budget for 1940-41 under the heading 'Education—additional teachers to Middle Schools.' "

In doing so, he stated that this question also had been referred to by many speakers in the course of the discussion on the budget. He was sure that Government were not unaware of the difficulties experienced in schools for want of sufficient staff and he requested that the resolution be considered sympathetically.

Mr. D. VENKATARAMANAPPA seconded the resolution.

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina K. V. Anantaraman) replied that in cases where the demand for additional staff was very great, sanction would be accorded for appointing extra hands even if there was no specific provision in the budget, the cost being met from general savings. But the chief difficulty in most cases was about accommodation, and even this question was engaging the serious consideration of Government. Thus Government were quite willing to accept the principle underlying this resolution.

The resolution was thereupon withdrawn by leave of the House.

Resolution No. 3.

Expansion of Primary Education.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA moved the following resolution :—

" This Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that they will be pleased to enhance the provision made in the Budget for 1940-41 under the heading 'Expansion of Primary Education.' "

He was glad that in reply to a question pertaining to this subject, Government had stated that about Rs. 2 lakhs would be provided for the expansion of primary education. In view of that reply he hoped that Government would find no difficulty in the way of accepting this resolution also.

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina K. V. Anantaraman) replied that the Elementary Education Committee, copies of whose report had already been circulated to members, had indicated in their report what action should be taken in this matter. If action on those lines was taken, it would result in the creation of better facilities for the spread of education; and if only the members would support the proposals of the committee, including the proposal to levy fees in all middle schools in the cities, with provision to grant a reasonable number of scholarships and freeships, it would be possible to provide a sufficiently large number of middle schools very early.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA, interrupting, pointed out that many a pupil from the villages was studying in city schools so that if fees were levied in such

schools, pupils from the villages would suffer.

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN replied that out of every 5 schools newly opened, 3 were going to the cities. It was not possible to run all such schools without levying fees at all. For the present, at any rate, fees would not be levied in middle schools in interior parts. Besides, as already stated, a sufficient number of scholarships and freeships would be provided, so that poor boys from the villages might not suffer.

In the previous resolution, it was suggested that middle schools must be opened in larger numbers. From enquiries made, it was found that every year about 25 to 39 new schools were being started. But after fees were abolished, many new schools could not be started in rural parts. Schools in the cities had however increased. In spite of it there was demand for more of them. This demand was being met as far as possible, but Government felt unable to start more schools. The Elementary Education Committee rightly suggested that better encouragement should be shown to rural parts. This was what was proposed to be done in future, without levying fees at the same time. As regards fees in schools in the cities, it would be well to remember that people there were actually spending a lot of money on account of private tuition, but if a sufficient number of teachers were appointed in the schools in the cities and the schools made to work more satisfactorily than at present, there would be no need for private tuitions and savings would accrue to the parents; and with a view to help the poor pupils, an adequate number of scholarships would be provided.

Another suggestion of the committee was that a school should be given for every village containing a population of more than 300, and that the responsibility now vesting in the School Boards should be taken over by Government themselves.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA, again interrupting, explained that even villages with a population of more than 300 were not at present having middle schools and that students from many such villages were forced to go to the cities.

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN replied that it was not so in all cases though there might be many cases of that kind. The complaint which was sought to be remedied was that the villagers paid without deriving any benefit therefor whereas those in the cities derived all the benefit but paid nothing. If the proposals of the committee were given effect to, an extra income of Rs. 3 to 4 lakhs would accrue to Government and with the help of that money and a like contribution by Government the required number of schools could be opened in village parts.

Continuing, the MEMBER stated that whenever such big schemes were launched, a certain amount of difficulty to some sections of the population was inevitable And if people were not prepared to undergo a minimum amount of difficulty by agreeing to contribute something for their own children's education, obviously education could not make much progress. As the Director of Public Instruction had explained last time, it might be contended that every Government was bound to provide primary education for its subjects, free of cost. But the same could not be said of middle school education. Levy of fees in middle schools was made in all parts of India as well as in foreign countries. There could be no objection in principle therefore, to levying fees in Mysore also. Of course, it would not be possible to say how much exactly would be the income to Government if fees were levied. But to the extent that funds could be raised in that way, the question of opening more and more middle schools would be brought into the field of practical politics. And if members agreed to the principle, Government would consult the Legislative Council and bring up a bill before the Dasara Session of the Representative Assembly on the lines already explained.

Mr. NAWAB SHER KHAN stated that the report was discussed by the Mahomedan Education Advisory Committee and that the members had all

agreed that Government should please give effect to the proposals of the Committee without any delay whatsoever.

Continuing, **Mr. ANANTARAMAN** said that along with the opening of more primary schools it was necessary to provide new middle schools wherever necessary. This could be done by levying fees in the middle schools in the cities, making provision at the same time for a large number of scholarships and freeships. If the Assembly agreed to that scheme, he said that the Government would be prepared to consider sympathetically, the suggestion contained in the resolution.

Mr. NAWAB SHER KHAN said that unless the Government took over control of primary education, no progress whatever was possible.

Mr. ABDUL RASOOL SAB said that he would agree to the proposal if the levy of fees was not confined to cities alone but made applicable to all district headquarter towns also.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA opposed the above suggestion on the ground that once the principle of levying fees in towns was conceded, there was nothing to prevent the Government extending it to the interior parts of the State also, justifying the same on the score of having to open a large number of middle schools therein. After all, the income that was expected from the levy of the fees was not much. Middle school education was the fundamental right of every citizen, and as such the Government must bear the entire cost thereof. They must provide the required number of middle schools without resorting to the levy of fees.

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN remarked that nowhere it had been defined that middle school education was one of the fundamental rights of the citizen.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA replied that no less a body than the National Planning Committee had stated that education up to the S.S.L.C. standard constituted such a fundamental right.

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN replied that so far as the resolution under discussion went, he would not commit the House to anything except that it agreed to the examination of the proposal in a sympathetic way by the Government.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA, in replying to the debate on the resolution, explained that his object in moving the resolution would be met if Government agreed to allot some more funds for expansion of primary education out of the general savings in the budget. He was sorry that he could not agree to the suggestion to re-impose fees in middle schools immediately to provide funds for opening new schools in the future. It was contended that the rates of fees obtaining in Mysore was very low compared to the rates prevailing in other parts of the country, but still the State was lagging behind some other States in point of education. It was not desirable that such a state of affairs should exist in a State which had earned the renown of a "Ramarajya." The Government had been spending crores of rupees with the object of accelerating the progress of Mysore, and they should not stint some more expenditure for the advancement of education.

Proceeding, **Mr. BYANNA** said that lack of education on the part of the masses was responsible for the political agitation that was being carried on in the State at present and that if every villager had been educated, he would not have fallen a victim to the machinations of the agitators. He was therefore of the opinion that the Government were blameworthy in this respect.

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN remarked that it had become a fashion to hold Government responsible for all sins.

Concluding, **Mr. BYANNA** appealed to the Government to consider his request favourably in view of the fact that they had a windfall of Rs. 26 lakhs from gold mining.

The resolution was, however, not pressed.

Adjournment Motion.

Nominations to District Boards.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA moved for—

"The adjournment of the House for discussing an urgent matter of public importance, *viz.*, the

policy underlying the question of the recent nominations made by the Government to the several District Boards in the State."

At the outset, the member thanked the President for having admitted the adjournment motion for discussion. This motion related to a matter of considerable importance to non-official public, *viz.*, exercise of political power through elections. It was a recognized fact in all parts of India that the system of nominations to the councils of the State deserved to be done away with. In spite of it, the system continued to prevail in Mysore due to some peculiar circumstances. It might be contended that it was taken recourse to because the minority communities and special interests would otherwise go without representation and that as a safeguard, certain number of seats were reserved for such interests. His object in moving this motion was to examine how far this principle was respected in the recent nominations to district boards. For purposes of discussion, he classified the candidates recently nominated under three heads : *viz.*, (1) defeated candidates, (2) candidates belonging to communities already well represented on the district boards, and (3) the candidate nominated in a vacancy created by the demise of an elected representative who had not yet taken his seat, and its legality.

Mr. J. ASWATHANARAYANA RAO, interrupting the mover, raised a point of order that the third point referred to by the mover did not fall within the purview of the adjournment motion, as it depended upon the interpretation of a particular section of the District Boards Act and hence it was a matter for decision by a competent court.

Thereupon, **Mr. BYANNA** agreed not to press that point.

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina K. V. Anantaraman) explained that the point of order raised held good as it related to the operation of election rules. He wondered whether the mover was prepared to challenge the action of the Government.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA admitted that it was open to the aggrieved parties to challenge it in a court of law. His point, however, was that even the Government were not infallible and it was open to them to rectify the mistakes, brought to their notice.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA pointed out that the objection taken was to the action of the Government in filling up that casual vacancy without a bye-election. He therefore thought that the President's ruling on the point of order raised was called for.

The PRESIDENT regretted to have to make a frank observation that certain members seemed to be obsessed by petty jealousies. The criticisms did not seem to be based so much on policies as on personalities. He was afraid that such an attitude would create difficulties both to the public and to the Government. He appealed to the House to remember that public interests must be served first.

Thereupon, **Mr. BYANNA** hastened to assure the President that he was not at all impelled by motives of jealousy in giving notice of the motion under discussion. As a result of false propaganda carried on by interested parties, the question of recent nominations was being discussed freely in the streets. The speaker felt that the Government's reputation was being brought into stake and that he owed a duty to himself to get the position cleared so as to remove any misapprehension that might be lurking in the public mind.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA, as one of the movers, added that it was far from the movers' mind to cast any slur on the candidates actually nominated. On that point, he was prepared to acknowledge openly that they were all persons who commanded respect throughout the State, that they were members who could be depended upon to bring credit to any public body in the State by their membership and that they were persons who had rendered yeoman services not only to their respective districts but to the State as a whole. So, from the point of view of individuals concerned, he had no hesitation in owning that the Government had certainly made the right choice. But what he was concerned with just then was not a

question of personalities but the fact that law was blind and it was not a respector of persons. It applied the same standards irrespective of the man's worth and came to the same conclusion under a given set of circumstances.

Proceeding, he said that though it might be argued that the rules did not prohibit the nomination of defeated candidates, he was concerned with the psychological effect produced in the public mind by such an action on the part of the Government. In the case under reference, he said that the matter should be viewed from the democratic principle involved in it. If the particular candidates failed to poll the required votes, it only showed their unpopularity. And if the Government should bring them in by exercising their power of nomination, it was sure to create an unhappy feeling on the part of the electors who did not want to return those candidates that their freedom had been unnecessarily tampered with. A public body composed of such nominated individuals and duly elected representatives of the people would evolve into two distinct parties, one party in favour of Government and the other against the Government. For that very reason, even if the nominated candidates were the very best persons, the electors were likely to mistake the Government for having nominated them. The primary object of Government was that the work should go on smoothly and that object, he said, might have been secured without having recourse to the nomination of defeated candidates. People's voice was the best voice, according to the speaker; and there was a definite feeling in the public mind that the nomination of the persons under advertence was opposed to democratic principles. His object, therefore, in supporting the motion before the House, was to persuade the Government to abstain from nominating defeated candidates in future at least.

Mr. Balfam SRINIVASA RAO mentioned the following facts connected with the recent district board elections, with a view to wipe off the false impressions created by wild rumours set afloat by interested parties. Certain prominent persons who had already rendered invaluable services as members of district boards had stood for election, but somehow they were not returned in the general elections. The improvement works which they had commenced as members of the district boards during the previous triennium had been left unfinished. It was felt that they were the best fitted persons to complete those works. Besides, 90 per cent of the members actually returned to the district boards at the recent elections were raw men with no manner of knowledge or experience about district board management. When such types of persons were returned, the Government had a duty to see that men of experience were associated with them so that the district board's work might not suffer. Hence some of the old members with sufficient experience of local self-government were actually nominated by Government. He was of opinion that the Government deserved the gratitude of the people for their thoughtful action, and that no principle was sacrificed by the step taken by them.

He next pointed out that it was not correct to say that nominations were intended to secure the interests of minorities only. It was also intended to secure the representation of experts and persons of experience The speaker did not also subscribe to the fantastic statement that the candidates under reference had lost the confidence of the voters. According to him, it was possible for one political party to sweep the polls by raising false hopes in the minds of the unsophisticated voters in the mofussil. In conclusion, he said that he had no manner of doubt that Government were impelled by the best of motives in nominating to the boards competent persons with previous experience. He therefore opposed the adjournment motion.

Mr. K. N. PUTTANNA stated that it was not correct to contend that the interests of minority communities had been sacrificed by the Government by nominating members of the majority communities to the district boards. Because, even if one such member of the minority community had been nominated to each

district board, there would still be several other minorities of the Hindu fold going without representation. So the action of Government was not impelled by communal considerations. Under the existing constitution, full discretion was vested in Government in the matter of nominations. That apart, the various shades of opinions expressed in the House on the motion under discussion bore testimony to the fact that the recent nominations were made in the best interests of the local bodies concerned. He was not prepared to admit the claim that only those who commanded the largest measure of public confidence were being returned in the general elections, as he had known several instances where such members had suffered defeat in the past. In the present state of public life in Mysore, success in elections depended more on the campaign of propaganda undertaken by each candidate. It was therefore not right to dogmatize that every elected member was a selfless person or that every nominated member was a selfseeking person.

Since the speaker had complete confidence in the judgment of the present Government, he congratulated the Government on the choice of their nominations to the district boards.

Mr. Khaji SYED YUSUF SAHIB opposed the motion before the House and commended the nominations made by the Government on the ground that they made it possible for the district boards to profit by the experience of people who had served the district boards creditably as presidents or vice-presidents. It was, however, a matter for regret to him that such competent persons were not returned by the voters. This, he said, must have been due to some extraneous influences which misguided the electors which, he had no doubt, would be regretted by them in due course.

Proceeding, the speaker said that the Government had made it clear where the electors had erred, by exercising their power of nomination in the manner they had done. That action, he said, was quite in consonance with parliamentary convention. Above all, the Government had a duty to see that the boards were enabled to function efficiently, and that duty they had discharged in the public interest. He therefore failed to see any point in the adjournment motion and hence he opposed it.

Mr. A. J. KHALEEL spoke as follows in English:—Sir, though in the past, I have spoken against the system of nominations, this time I feel I should oppose the motion which my friends, Messrs. B. L. Byanna and Bhupalam R. Chandrasekharayya have brought before this House. I do not know what reason there was for these gentlemen to bring this small fact before this House in the form of an adjournment motion. There was a time when votes had been given to animals and now the time had come for human beings to enjoy it. How far we are consuming this commodity in a neat way will be known by seeing those people who have acted worthily and discharged their duties in a selfless way for years together have been thrown overboard over-night. The electors have not exercised their votes properly. I do not know what happened over-night that these very people who have served them long should have been deserted as bad people in such a short time. Unfortunately, the class of people who have taken upon their shoulders to bring some trouble and discredit to those who are in authority—those very people are using this opportunity to go and sow seeds of dissention (A voice : Question !) and have poisoned the minds of illiterate people who have been called upon to exercise their votes. In such circumstances, if nominations are not made and if proper people are not returned, then law-abiding people will be thrown to the mercy of those who are sure to feed upon them In such a situation, if nomination is not done, I do not know in what other circumstances it can be done and how far the Government can be said to have discharged their duties properly. Because, a group of people—thank God some of them have become jobless now— had the time to go and do some little vile propaganda, they wanted to ruin certain gentlemen who had worked honestly for a very long time in the district boards. If these latter people had not got the votes from

the electors, they at least deserved nominations at the hands of the Government so that the district boards might be saved from the hands of those people who wanted to ruin them. The responsibility for elementary education was entrusted to these local bodies and we know what the result has been. There is a clamour on the part of the Musalmans for a very long time that their education is not safe in the hands of those local bodies. After trying the experiment for ten years or more, the Government have been forced to take back the powers. If the experience of this *Mabobcracy* had continued for some time more, we would have gone to the Government and said "We do not want this sort of democracy. Kindly take some more power off their hands because, they are not in a position to do justice to it." Such a day will come very shortly and I am sure about it.

I take this opportunity of thanking the Government for saving the Musalmans by giving separate electorates to them. Without this safeguard I do not know what would have happened to them in the circumstances prevailing now in the country. So, the adjournment motion brought in by my friends is as ill-timed as it is meaningless. Also I do not know why the Government thought it fit to allow one precious hour to be spent on it in this House.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA, interrupting the speaker, pointed out that the member was questioning the discretion of the President, which he had no right to do.

Mr. A. J. KHALEEL.—As the Khaji Sahib said, this motion has given an opportunity to some of the members to show to the outside world that the people who have supported the action of the Government in this respect, do not belong to the one class of people who think that virtue and *dharma* are their monopoly, and there was also an opportunity to them to show that things are not as bad as they wanted to make out to the world.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA.—That is an unwarranted imputation.

Mr. A. J. KHALEEL.—I feel it my duty to oppose this motion and say that the nominations made by the Government at this juncture are the only thing that could have possibly been done to save the administration from coming to a crash.

Mr. J. ASWATHANARAYANA RAO, who spoke next said that there were only two points raised by the movers which he desired to meet. The first was about the nomination of defeated candidates. On this, he said that rules governing nominations did not at all bind the hands of the Government and any restraint imposed was only on the action of the Deputy Commissioner. Hence he said that the Government had not acted against any rule in using their discretion and nominating certain defeated candidates because they happened to be men of knowledge and experience of district board work.

As regards the second point, *viz.*, of nominating a candidate in place of a deceased member returned in the elections, he explained that under Sections 13 and 28 of the District Boards Act, if immediately after the declaration of election results, a vacancy was created by resignation or decease of an elected member, the next candidate who had secured the highest number of votes should be declared as elected. For these reasons, he said that there was no irregularity in the nominations as alleged in the adjournment motion.

Mr. K. VENKATARAMIAH said that he failed to detect any violation of principle which the adjournment motion sought to criticise. The Government were perfectly right in nominating the sort of persons actually needed for the smooth running of the district board machinery. They had weighed the interests of all in the scale and made a very proper use of their discretionary powers in nominating the candidates. He wished the movers had realised that just as in elections, there were difficulties to be faced in deciding questions of nominations also, and that it was impossible for any Government to satisfy all interests in the State at one and the same time. In that view, he said that there was no justification for criticising the action of the Government

in the manner that the movers had done.

Messrs. B. CHAMIAH, Isthuri SAMPANGIRAMIAH, Rayara KEMPANNA and **B. L. HUTCHAPPA** justified the action of the Government in having nominated defeated candidates on the ground that they were the best available in the present state of the country. The association of experienced men with raw men on the district boards would, in their opinion, conduce to the smooth running of the local self-government machinery.

Mr. A. VENKATESAIYA, in supporting the motion, drew pointed attention to the principle underlying the constitution of non-official bodies, *viz.*, that non-official candidates returned by a majority vote of the electors alone should have the right to represent them. This principle was set at naught by nominating defeated candidates. In his opinion, no particular individual should be indispensable for the management of any institution. So long as an organisation was run on sound principles, the machinery could be worked by any person of ordinary capabilities.

The speaker was also of opinion that there was no grace in a defeated candidate accepting nomination at the hands of the Government, and he was at a loss to reconcile himself with a position like that. He was also of opinion that it was a wrong notion and a narrow view to take that a person could render service to the public only as a member of a public body.

Proceeding, **Mr. VENKATESAIYA** wondered if Government could not find any other candidates for nomination than pitching upon defeated candidates. If the State should advance politically, on democratic lines, the Government should do everything to contribute to the development of self-governing institutions by creating opportunities for fresh blood also to get in and acquire the required knowledge and experience. If, however, the Government felt that the voters faile to exercise their franchise rights properly, he suggested that the best thing to do would be to dispense with the system of elections altogether and run the local bodies with the help of nominated candidates.

Mr. C. SUBBANNA NAIK said that the ultimate responsibility for the smooth working of the local bodies vested in the Government, as was evidenced by the orders of supersession of certain municipalities issued by them from time to time. Such cases went to show that the electors did not always make a right choice of their representatives. Hence he said that the Government's discretion in nominating the best available men from among public workers should be respected. He therefore opposed the motion.

Mr. K. LAKSHMINARAYANA RAO remarked that the democratic principle underlying elections should not be reduced to a farce. So long as that principle was recognized, he said that there must be full scope for its play. It was also fair, in his opinion, that Government should respect the judgment of electors and abstain themselves from nominating defeated candidates.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA, in replying to the debate on the adjournment motion, said that in speaking on the motion his object was to communicate to the Government the public feeling on their action in connection with the district board nominations. Seeing that it was human to err, he thought that Government also might have erred in their choice. Government should welcome criticisms offered in the right spirit and take action to rectify acts of commission and omission, if any. In spite of the support which the Government might command in the House, he said that if their action was wrong in principle, it would be but right that they avoided such mistakes in future.

In conclusion, he hoped that the Government would become more and more responsive to public opinion and adjust their policies in consonance with the spirit of the times.

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina K. V. Anantaraman) speaking on behalf of the Government, observed that the mover had raised two points for discussion. The first was that nominations had been made of members of communities who had already secured

adequate representation at the elections. The second point was that persons who had been defeated at the elections and who were unpopular and unacceptable to the people had been nominated in violation of sound principles and standing orders. Before answering those two criticisms, he wished to enlighten the House on one or two points. From the discussions that had proceeded so far, there seemed to be a feeling that there was a rule prohibiting the nomination of defeated candidates. In point of fact, there was no such rule. The power of Government to make nominations was not limited by any restriction. Government had the power to nominate any one. It was probable that the members were thinking of the Government Order passed in 1932 in which two matters relevant to the present discussion were dealt with.

Here, the MEMBER read out the following extract for the elucidation of the House :—

" It is no longer necessary to attempt to secure representation in them of all the numerous sects of the Hindu community, as there is very little divergence between the interests of one sect and those of another in matters pertaining to district board administration. "

and observed that there was no basis for the assumption that representation on local bodies should be given according to the numerical strength of communities. The Government Order further stated that " a person who stands for election and who is not elected should not ordinarily be recommended for nomination." That was not a restriction imposed on Government. That was an instruction given to Deputy Commissioners for their guidance in making recommendations. There was no absolute prohibition that defeated candidates should not be recommended for nomination. In certain circumstances if the nomination of such persons should be considered necessary, the Deputy Commissioners were certainly free to recommend them. The Government did not wish to fetter the discretion of Deputy Commissioners.

Proceeding, Mr. ANANTARAMAN observed that the total number of members on the nine District Boards was 259. Of this, 175 were elected and 47 were nominated. The number of members appointed *ex-officio* was 37. The number of defeated candidates who were nominated was only 5. These persons had taken a great deal of interest in the past in the work of their district boards and were certain to be of great use to the concerned district boards in the future also. Their names were recommended by the Deputy Commissioners for nomination and Government accepted the recommendation.

Continuing, the MEMBER of COUNCIL pointed out that even Mr. Bhupalam Chandrasekharayya, one of the movers of the adjournment motion, conceded that those individuals were persons with creditable records of service and that he had nothing to say against them personally. In the face of such a statement, the speaker wondered how it could be contended that the nominations could be considered unsuitable or improper. The conclusion should clearly be the other way, that Government did the right thing in saving to the district boards the valuable experience and devoted work of those men.

The MEMBER next referred to the criticism that the defeated candidates had not obviously the confidence of the electorate and that they should therefore not have been nominated. The member asked whether, if a particular candidate polled 1,000 votes and another only 999, the latter could be said to be unpopular. In the case of the elections under discussion, if all the voters had cast their votes for or against a particular candidate, then, one could say if a candidate was popular or otherwise. Simply because there was a difference of 10 or 20 votes between the successful and the unsuccessful candidates, it would not be correct to dub the defeated candidates as unpopular or unacceptable to the electorate.

The MEMBER laid emphasis on another point, *viz.*, that it was necessary to have on the Boards men with experience of Local Board administration. For work on committees and for framing rules, etc., it was necessary to have the services of such men. Considering that there were only a few seats reserved for nomination, Government had to use

their discretion in the best interests of the district board administration.

In conclusion, he assured the House that as a result of the nomination of 5 candidates objected to by the movers of the adjournment motion, it could not be contended that the whole principle of democracy had been thrown overboard or that the freedom of the large body of elected members had been imperilled.

The adjournment motion was not pressed.

At 5-10 p.m., the Assembly adjourned to meet again at 8 a.m., on the following day.

SEVENTH DAY.

Saturday, 15th June 1940.

The House reassembled at the Jagan Mohan Palace Pavilion on Saturday, 15th June 1940, at 8 of the clock, Mr. President (*Amin-ul-Mulk* Sir Mirza M. Ismail, K.C.I.E., O.B.E., Dewan) in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS *concld.*

Supervision of the Affairs of the Sringeri and Yelandur Jahgirs.

Q.—49. Mr. H. M. MALLIKARJUNAPPA (Tarikere Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the management and supervision of the affairs of the Sringeri and Yelandur Jahgirs are vested in Government;

(*b*) the Deputy Commissioners of which districts are supervising their affairs;

(*c*) when these officers visit these jahgirs, from what source is their travelling allowance met;

(*d*) whether, in the District Offices where the jahgir correspondence is attended to, there are separate clerks paid out of jahgir funds;

(*e*) if not, whether any allowance is being paid to the Government staff who attend to this work;

(*f*) for what further period do the Government contemplate retaining the management of these jahgirs?

A.—The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Rajasevaprasaktha B. T. Kesavalengar).—

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The Deputy Commissioners of Kadur and Mysore Districts, respectively.

(*c*) From general revenues.

(*d*) *Sringeri Jahgir.*—The appointment of a whole-time clerk on Rs. 25 per mensem in the Kadur District Office for attending to the work relating to Sringeri Jahgir has recently been sanctioned tentatively for a period of one year (*vide* G. O. No. 2222-4—Muz. 283-39-2, dated the 29th April 1940). His pay is met from the jahgir funds.

Yelandur Jahgir.—There is no whole-time clerk in the Mysore District Office for attending to the correspondence relating to Yelandur Jahgir. A clerk on Rs. 30 per mensem in Nanjangud Sub-Division Office attends to this work. His pay is debited to jahgir funds.

(*e*) *Sringeri Jahgir.*—An allowance of Rs. 5 per mensem to the clerk in Chikmagalur Taluk Office who attends to the correspondence of Belavadi